

REMARKS

On entry of this response, claims 1, 5, 12 and 16 have been amended and claim 23 canceled. Claims 1-22 and 24-36 are pending, of which claims 1, 12 and 16 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims define over the prior art of record.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 12 were objected to because of minor informalities. (Office Action, page 2). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 12 add the phrase “Location Based Service” after “LBS,” as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 1 and 12 be withdrawn.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph

Claims 16-33 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. (Office Action, page 2). Applicants have amended claim 16 to change “IP-801-1” to “IS-801-1.” Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 16-33 and 36 be withdrawn.

Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. (Office Action, page 2). The Examiner alleges that “[t]here is insufficient explanation of the term ‘information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90.’” (Office Action, pages 2 and 3). Applicants submit that the term is explained in Figure 3 and corresponding description of the present application, for example, pages 18-20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of claim 36 be withdrawn.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enabling requirement. (Office Action, page 3). The Examiner alleges that “[t]here is insufficient explanation of the term ‘WGS (World Geodetic System)-84.’” (Office Action, page 3). Applicant submit that the term “WGS (World Geodetic System)-84” is well known in the art. For example, those of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that the term “WGS (World Geodetic System)-84” refers to an earth-centered reference system which was used by the United States Defense Mapping Agency, and which is currently used for the GPS satellite navigation system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-25 and 27-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 6,650,902 (hereinafter “Richton”). (Office Action, page 3). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A. Independent Claims 1, 12 and 16

Independent claim 1, 12 and 16 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 23. Claim 23 has been canceled. Amended independent claims 1, 12 and 16, among other features, recite:

each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degrees to 90 degrees.

Applicants submit that Richton fails to disclose at least the following feature of claim s 1, 12 and 16: ***“each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees*** (emphasis added).”

Richton discloses a wireless telecommunications system using location or position information of a wireless mobile unit to initiate the sending of location-specific information to travelers. (Richton, Abstract). Richton also discloses that information, such as airline arrival information, is retrieved and sent to the wireless mobile unit of the traveler. (Richton, Abstract).

Richton, however, does not disclose that “each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees,” as required by claims 1, 12 and 16. There is no disclosure in Richton of how each of the information on GPS satellite is displayed.

In view of reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Richton fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Applicants, therefore, request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of claims 1, 12 and 16 be withdrawn.

B. Dependent claims 3-6, 9-11, 14-15, 17-25 and 27-32

Claims 3-6 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. For at least the reasons presented above in connection with claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of claims 3-6 and 9-11 be withdrawn.

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 12 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 12. For at least the reasons presented above in connection with claim 12, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 14-15 be withdrawn.

Claims 17-25 and 27-32 depend from claim 16 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 16. For at least the reasons presented above in connection with claim 16, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 17-25 and 27-32 be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton. (Office Action, page 7). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 26 depends from claim 16 and, as such, incorporates the subject matter of claim 16. Applicants submit that Richton fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 16: “each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees.” Claim 26, which depends from claim 16, is not rendered unpatentable over Richton.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 26 be withdrawn.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2, 7-8, 13 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of well-known prior art. (Office Action, page 8). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Dependent claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35

Claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. Applicants submit that Richton and well-known prior art fail to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 1: “each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees.” Claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35, which depend from claim 1, are not rendered unpatentable over Richton and well-known prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35 be withdrawn.

B. Dependent claim 13

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and, as such, incorporates the subject matter of claim 12. Applicants submit that Richton and well-known prior art fail to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 12: “each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees.” Therefore, claim 13, which depends from claim 12, is not rendered unpatentable over Richton and well-known prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

C. Dependent claims 33 and 36

Claims 33 and 36 depend from claim 16 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 12. Applicants submit that Richton and well-known prior art fail to disclose or suggest at

least the following feature of claim 16: “each of the information on GPS satellite is distinctively indicated with different color, text or pattern on a screen displaying more than one concentric circles and 4 directional intersections, the concentric circles consecutively indicating angles ranging from 0 degree to 90 degrees.” Therefore, claims 33 and 36, which depend from claim 16, are not rendered unpatentable over Richton and well-known prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 33 and 36 be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /EuiHoon Lee/
Registration No.: L0248
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant